

REMARKS

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11-14, and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over an article authored by Thomas A. Nobbe and entitled, "Robots Go Where No Man Has Gone Before" (hereinafter Robots) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,658,325 B2 (Zweig).

Robots describes teleoperators and telerobots that are used to perform work that is considered dangerous for humans. In particular, according to the article, an operator of a teleoperator or telerobot can sit safely in front of a console and let the teleoperator or telerobot perform the dangerous work. The operator can see the robot movements on a television screen and can maneuver the robot with a joystick, knob, or other input device. The article further states that the robot "sees" through video cameras and has the mechanical equivalent of arms and hands to manipulate objects and perform other tasks. See Robots, pages 52 and 56 (pages 1 and 4, respectively, as identified by the Examiner).

Zweig is directed to a computerized mobile robot with an onboard internet web server and a capability of establishing a connection to a remote web browser on the Internet for robotic control. According to Zweig, a remote user on the Internet may direct the robot to move within a range of the external devices and send and receive commands to/from the external devices, which are digital-radio equipped. See Zweig, column 10, lines 13-22.

The present invention is directed to technology for selling or purchasing merchandise via a network. The invention can include a user terminal, an intermediation server and a shop server. See Fig. 1. As defined by independent claims 1, 7 and 12, if instruction information regarding moving an item, for example, an instruction regarding turning the item over, up, down, turning over right and left, zooming, etc., is received from a user terminal, a first request acquiring image information according to the "moving" of the item is outputted to a photographic apparatus. See Specification, page 4, lines 18-25. For example, if an instruction is received from a user terminal indicating that an item should be turned up, a photographing request indicating that an image should be acquired of the item in its upright position is output to the photographic

Applicants respectfully submit that the references do not teach or suggest outputting to a robot, a first request for acquiring image information *according to moving of the selected article*, as specified by the language of the independent claims. In Robots, the "TV cameras" on the robot simply allow the person controlling the robot to see the moves made by the robot, for

example, when the robot moves forward. The “video cameras” referenced in robots merely allow the robot to “see” its environment, for example, to see what is in front of the robot. Although the article specifies that the robot has the mechanical equivalent of arms and hands to manipulate objects, no information is provided or suggested regarding a request for acquiring image information *according to moving of a selected article*. In contrast to the present invention, at most, one may infer from Robots that video image information of the robot’s environment may simply be acquired.

Applicant respectfully submit that Zweig also does not teach or suggest the above-identified feature. Zweig is silent as to acquiring image information *according to moving of a selected article*. In fact, one of the sections cited by the Examiner, column 3, lines 19-22 of Zweig, indicates that the robot has no arms or actuators and merely serves as a training device. Thus, it follows that such a robot cannot provide images in response to an item having been turned over, for example. The other section of Zweig cited by the Examiner, that is, column 4, lines 30-31 simply indicates that the robot can interact with specially modified, robotic cooperative appliances. No information is provided or suggested regarding outputting a first request for acquiring image information according to moving an item if instruction information is received regarding moving the item.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7 and 12 are patentable over the references, as neither Robots nor Zweig, taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified feature of the claims. As claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 depend from respective independent claims, the dependent claims are also patentable over the references.

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Robot and Zweig as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Van Kommer.

As claim 18 depends from independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented above for claim 1. In addition, claim 18 is patentable over the references for other reasons. In particular, for example, Van Kommer does not teach or suggest, “if a voice request is received, outputting to said robot including a microphone, an instruction to obtain voice information within said real shop.”

For example, according to Van Kommer, it is directed to a mobile robot including a microphone. According to Van Kommer, the microphone is connected to a voice analysis module and enables a human operator within “earshot” of the mobile robot to control movement

of the robot through voice commands. Therefore, in contrast to the present invention, the robot in Van Kommer does not include a microphone that *obtains voice information* within a shop. Rather, the microphone in Van Kommer is simply used to allow a user to *transmit* voice commands to the robot and does not allow a user to obtain voice information from within a shop.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY, LLP

Date: 1/23/06

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501